

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action dated December 12, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1, 4-14, and 16-36 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 11, 14, 21, and 29 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated December 12, 2006, Claims 1, 4-14, and 16-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Following this response, Claims 1, 4-14, and 16-37 remain in this application with new Claim 37 being added by this Amendment. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. **Interview Summary**

Applicant thanks Examiner Patel for the courtesy of a telephone interview on February 23, 2007, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102. During the interview, Applicants highlighted proposed claim amendments and deficiencies in the cited references. The Examiner indicated the proposed amendments appear to overcome the cited references however further searching of the art would be required. No agreement regarding patentability was reached.

II. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 4-14, and 16-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Storch*. Claims 1, 11, 14, 21, and 29 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "the electronic message being separated into at least two portions being respectively customized for transmission to different groups of technicians; customization of the at least two portions being dependent on a plurality of profile characteristics stored in the administration system." Amended Claims 11, 14, 21, and 29 each includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least in paragraph [0025], lines 3-5 and paragraph [0027], lines 1-3.

Consistent with embodiments of the invention, an electronic message 32 may be submitted in a format that substantially fills an available space on a screen display 2A. (See specification, paragraph [0025], lines 1-3.) Electronic message 32, may be separated into two or more portions to allow different messages to be displayed from different sources. (See specification, paragraph [0025], lines 3-5.) In addition, the two or more portions of the electronic message may be customized for transmission to different groups of technicians. (See specification, paragraph [0027], lines 1-3.) For example, this customization of the two or more portions may be dependent on a number of profile characteristics stored in an administration system for various technicians. (See specification, paragraph [0027], lines 3-5.)

In contrast, *Storch* at least does not disclose any of the aforementioned recitations. For example, *Storch* merely discloses that when a Work Force Administration/Dispatch Out (WFA/DO) system determines the best job match for a technician, the WFA/DO system transmits a copy of a service order to the technician via a technician access unit (TAU) and system (TAS). (See col. 71, lines 44-47.) In *Storch*, depending on the nature of a requested service and a system configuration, typically the system performs input, processing, storage, output, and control functions on data used to generate a service order. (See col. 16, lines 51-63.) Alternatively, in *Storch*, a customer may input a request through a customer direct access computer order entry system. (See col. 16, lines 64-65.) In *Storch*, the WFA/DO then changes the status of the job from "pending load" or "pending dispatch" to "dispatched." (See col. 71, lines 47-49.) *Storch* does not disclose an electronic message having multiple portions customized for transmission to different groups of technicians because *Storch* is silent regarding the message having multiple customized portions.

Storch does not anticipate the claimed invention because *Storch* at least does not disclose "the electronic message being separated into at least two portions being respectively customized for transmission to different groups of technicians, customization of the at least two portions being dependent on a plurality of profile characteristics stored in the administration system," as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claims 11, 14, 21, and 29 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 11, 14, 21, and 29 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 11, 14, 21, and 29.

Dependent Claims 4-10, 12-13, and 16-20, 22-28, and 30-36 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 11, 14, 21, and 29, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 11, 14, 21, and 29. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 4-10, 12-13, and 16-20, 22-28, and 30-36.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Final Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Final Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge
any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

Date: March 9, 2007

DKS:mdc


D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

39262
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE